

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 State of Arizona, *ex rel.* Kristin K. Mayes, Attorney General; *et al.*, }
9 Plaintiffs, }
10 v. }
11 Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid Telecom; *et al.*, }
12 Defendants. }
13 _____ }
14 No. CIV 23-233-TUC-CKJ (MAA)
15 ORDER

16 Pending before the Court are the discovery disputes presented to the Court by
17 Plaintiffs State of Arizona, *ex rel.* Kristin K. Mayes, *et al.* (Doc. 134) and Defendants
18 Michael D. Lansky, *et al* (Doc. 138). On August 11, 2025, Plaintiffs asked, via email, the
19 Court to refer discovery dispute issues to a magistrate judge; Defendants have not stated any
opposition to this request. The Court finds it appropriate to refer the discovery disputes to
a magistrate judge.

20 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED:

21 1. The pending discovery disputes (Docs. 134, 138), any future discovery
22 disputes, and any other discovery-related matters that may arise in this matter are referred,
23 by random assignment, to the Hon. Michael A. Ambri.

24 2. Magistrate Judge Ambri is authorized to modify the Case Management
25 Scheduling Order if he finds it appropriate.

26 DATED this 24th day of September, 2025.

27
28 

Cindy K. Jorgenson
United States District Judge